

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EVERETT L. HOLLAND,

Plaintiff,

v.

M.S. EVANS, warden; et al.,

Defendants.


No. C 10-2140 SI (pr)

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

On October 25, 2010 and again on January 27, 2011, mail was sent to plaintiff at the address he provided to the court, and was returned undelivered on February 10, 2011, marked "return to sender/refused/unable to forward." Docket # 11. Plaintiff has not provided a new address to replace the one to which the undeliverable mail was sent. More than sixty days have passed since the mail was returned to the court undelivered. Plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 3-11(a) which requires that a party proceeding pro se must "promptly file with the Court and serve upon all opposing parties a Notice of Change of Address specifying the new address" when his address changes. Local Rule 3-11(b) allows the court to dismiss a complaint without prejudice when mail directed to a pro se party is returned as not deliverable and the pro se party fails to file a notice of his current address within sixty days of the return of the undelivered mail. For the foregoing reasons, this action is dismissed without prejudice because plaintiff failed to keep the court informed of his address in compliance with Local Rule 3-11(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 13, 2011

  
SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge